

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and following remarks.

The Official Action objects to the drawings for including hand-drawn reference numbers and figure numbers. However, the rules do not preclude hand-drawn reference numbers and figure numbers. Moreover, the drawings are not otherwise objectionable. Indeed, the Official Action has not set forth any additional grounds for the drawing objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The attached substitute specification amends the title and provides section headings. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is therefore respectfully requested.

As amended, Claim 10 recites method steps. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

The claims are also amended to address the issues set forth in the discussion starting at the bottom of page 5 through page 6 of the Official Action. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

Before turning to the prior art rejections, a general discussion of the embodiment illustrated in Figs. 2A-2C is provided. An interferometer includes a beamsplitter 10, an end reflector 11 constituted by plane reflectors, a first angle reflector 14 and a second angle reflector 15, each constituted by plane reflectors, for reflecting the beams between the beamsplitter 10 and the end reflector 11, the first and the second angle reflector being rotatable around an axis ω . As illustrated in

Fig. 1, the angle line A3 of the end reflector 11 is arranged perpendicular to the angle lines A1 and A2 of the first and second angle reflectors 14 and 15. As discussed in the paragraph starting on line 23 of page 11, this arrangement allows the optical path difference between beams to change quickly in proportion to a shift in the rotational angle of the first and second angle reflectors 14 and 15.

Claim 1 is rejected as being anticipated by Tank.

Claim 1 recites an interferometer including a beamsplitter, an end reflector constituted by plane reflectors, a first angle reflector and a second angle reflector, each constituted by plane reflectors, for reflecting the beams between the beamsplitter and the end reflector, the first and the second angle reflector being rotatable around an axis, and the angle line of the end reflector being arranged perpendicular to the angle lines and of the first and second angle reflectors.

The Official Action interprets Tank's stationary retroreflectors 81 and 82 as corresponding to end reflectors, and the rotating retroreflectors 71-74 as corresponding to angle reflectors. Assuming for the sake of discussion that a reasonable basis exists for the Official Action's interpretations, the claim is still not anticipated by Tank because, for the reasons discussed below, the angle lines of the stationary retroreflectors 81 and 82 are not perpendicular to the angle lines of any of the rotating retroreflectors 71-74.

As discussed in Tank's title and illustrated in Tank's drawings, the stationary retroreflectors 81 and 82 and the rotating retroreflectors 71-74 all comprise corner cube-type reflectors, which each have three mutually perpendicular plane reflectors and angle lines. Lines 54-66 of column 4, and lines 11-22 of column 5, of Tank disclose that the rotation axes 71D-74D of the rotating retroreflectors 71-74 are

parallel to but offset laterally by the same distance d with respect to the symmetrical centers of the rotating retroreflectors 71-74, and are inclined at the same angle α with respect to the optical axes II_2 , II_2' , II_3 and II_3' of the rotating retroreflectors 71-74.

Tank does not disclose that an angle line of a rotating retroreflector 71-74 is perpendicular to an angle line of a stationary reflector 81 and 82 at any time during rotation of the rotating retroreflectors 71-74. Moreover, Tank's interferometer would not work as intended if a rotating retroreflector 71-74 was rotatable such that one of its angle lines were perpendicular to one of the angle lines of a stationary retroreflector 81 and 82.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Tank, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 as being anticipated by Tank is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 10 and 11 are also allowable for reasons consistent with the above discussion.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims, and therefore no further discussion of the dependent claims is needed.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 30, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620